18:01:46 OCA PAD INITIATION - PROJECT HEADER INFORMATION 10/27/92

Active

Project #: D-48-A27 Cost share #: D-48-339 Rev #: 0
Center # : 10/24-6-R7614-0A0 Center shr #: 10/22-1-F7614-0A0 OCA file #:
Work type : RES
Contract#: X994301-92-0 Mod #: INITIATION Document : GRANT
Prime #: Contract entity: GTRC

Subprojects ? : N CFDA: 66.SSI
Main project #: PE #: BMMC2E

Project unit: DEAN ARCH Unit code: 02.010.170
Project director(s):
BOURNE R G DEAN ARCH (404)894-2350

Sponsor/division names: ENVIRON PROTECTION AGENCY / EPA ATL - GA
Sponsor/division codes: 129 / 002

Award period: 920915 to 921231 (performance) 921231 (reports)

Sponsor amount	New this change	Total to date
Contract value	18,638.00	18,638.00
Funded	18,638.00	18,638.00
Cost sharing amount		981.00

Does subcontracting plan apply ?:

Title: EPA GROUND-WATER ROUNDTABLE_(FEDERAL INTER-AGENCY ROUNDTABLE)

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION DATA

OCA contact: Anita D. Rowland 894-4820

Sponsor technical contact

RON MIKULAK, PROJECT MANAGER
(404)347-3866

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
345 COURTLAND STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GA 30365

Sponsor issuing office

HECTOR A. BUITRAGO,GRANTS SPECIALIST
(404)347-2200

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
345 COURTLAND STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GA 30365

Security class (U,C,S,TS) : U ONR resident rep. is ACO (Y/N): N
Defense priority rating : NA NA supplemental sheet
Equipment title vests with: Sponsor GIT
NA
Administrative comments -
INITIATION OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT. REF. 40 CFR PARTS 30 & 33.

SR625

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Closeout Notice Date 10/20/93

Project No. D-48-A27_____ Center No. 10/24-6-R7614-0A0_

Project Director BOURNE R G_____ School/Lab DEAN ARCH_____

Sponsor ENVIRON PROTECTION AGENCY/EPA ATL - GA_____

Contract/Grant No. X994301-92-0_____ Contract Entity GTRC

Prime Contract No. _____

Title EPA GROUND-WATER ROUNDTABLE_(FEDERAL INTER-AGENCY ROUNDTABLE)_____

Effective Completion Date 921231 (Performance) 921231 (Reports)

Closeout Actions Required:	Y/N	Date Submitted
Final Invoice or Copy of Final Invoice	Y	930629
Final Report of Inventions and/or Subcontracts	N	_____
Government Property Inventory & Related Certificate	N	_____
Classified Material Certificate	N	_____
Release and Assignment	N	_____
Other _____	N	_____

Comments_____

_____

Subproject Under Main Project No. _____

Continues Project No. _____

Distribution Required:

Project Director	Y
Administrative Network Representative	Y
GTRI Accounting/Grants and Contracts	Y
Procurement/Supply Services	Y
Research Property Managment	Y
Research Security Services	N
Reports Coordinator (OCA)	Y
GTRC	Y
Project File	Y
Other Carl Baxter	N
_____	N

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY ROUNDTABLE

In Support of
Implementing EPA's Ground Water Protection Strategy

Sponsored by the United States
Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV
345 Courtland Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Final Report

Prepared by the

Southeast Negotiation Network
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0155
(404/853-9846)

February 1993

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY ROUNDTABLE

FINAL REPORT

Table of Contents

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY ROUNDTABLE

FINAL REPORT

I. Background

In 1991, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency distributed its strategy for protecting the nation's ground water. Since the Strategy is based primarily on state actions and programs, each state was given an opportunity to review and comment on the draft National Guidance that was being developed to support strategy implementation. In each EPA Region, representatives of state agencies with ground water responsibilities and programs convened to discuss the Strategy and related issues. One recommendation from the EPA Region IV State Ground Water Roundtable was for a similar meeting with representatives of Federal agencies involved with ground water protection, data collection and other ground water programs. EPA Region IV responded by convening the Region IV Federal Interagency Roundtable.

On October 20-21 1992, the Federal Interagency Roundtable met at the Penta Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia. More than sixty representatives from over a dozen Federal agencies participated in the Roundtable (see Table I-1 for the list of participants). Participants met in plenary sessions and were divided into four work groups to facilitate more detailed discussion on the issues. The Southeast Negotiation Network, a program of the Georgia Institute of Technology, planned and facilitated the Roundtable. Prior to the Roundtable meeting, a survey was sent to each prospective participant to assess existing Federal programs, responsibilities and mandates related to ground water protection. From that survey a matrix was compiled and presented for discussion at the meeting.

This meeting summary has been prepared from group flip chart notes taken during the Roundtable by the Southeast Negotiation Network.

II. Program Presentations

The Roundtable began with introductions by selected Federal agency and EPA representatives. The participants were asked to identify their goals and expectations for the Roundtable. The identified expectations included:

- Develop an exchange program to make available technical information, project status and ongoing activities amongst the various Federal agencies

- Develop better understanding of EPA's Ground Water "Strategy"
- Increase interagency communication, cooperation and coordination
- Define agency roles, voids, redundancies
- Identify and break down barriers between agencies/information sharing
- Develop strategy/responsibilities for measuring ground water flows and quality
- Commit to develop comprehensive Federal ground water protection program
- Address inconsistencies between state/Federal policies
- Address inconsistencies within agency policies
- Address inconsistencies among Federal regulations
- Establish cross-agency planning group
- Focus, prioritize and coordinate research needs
- Identify unanswered fundamental "technical" ground water questions
- Develop mechanisms to collect/share information critical to efficient and effective ground water resource protection and use
- Develop effective approaches to education/technical assistance
- Identify successful interagency programs, and
- Increase awareness of the importance of ground water to the environment.

Specific suggestions made during this discussion related to solutions, or mechanics, by which progress could be made:

- Schedule regular conferences among Federal agencies devoted to specific ground water protection issues
- Develop inter-agency agreements
- Designate liaisons for each Federal agency to stimulate implementation of coordinated and consistent ground water protection activities
- Increase interaction with CES (Community for Earth and Environmental Science), and
- Involve the Federal Interagency Natural Resources Group.

The facilitator acknowledged that while the Roundtable could not address all the issues and expectations raised, it could initiate dialogue and help develop a plan and process for addressing specific ground water issues.

Opening comments were delivered by Patrick Tobin, Deputy Regional Administrator for EPA Region IV. Mr. Tobin indicated the necessity of developing greater cooperation and coordination amongst Federal agencies themselves and with EPA in order to accomplish protection of ground water resources. He stressed that Federal agency cooperation and coordination is crucial to accomplish the objectives of EPA's Ground Water Strategy.

Allan Antley, Associate Director of the Water Management Division in EPA Region IV, spoke about the development of the Ground Water Protection Strategy for the 90's and emphasized that its development is in large part a response to the nation's historic dependence on ground water for drinking water. The Agency is now recognizing the importance of ground water to the environment in addition to its value as a drinking water source. Currently, ground water programs exist at all levels of government. Coordination and cooperation at all levels is necessary.

EPA's Ground Water Strategy focuses on identifying gaps in the Agency's existing ability to protect ground water and developing consistency among state programs impacting ground water. In addition, the Strategy focuses on developing state capacity to implement comprehensive ground water protection programs.

The Agency's Ground Water Strategy outlines six strategic activities for developing a Comprehensive State Ground Water Protection Program (CSGWPP). The anticipated benefits of the CSGWPP approach are; better resource protection, more efficient program management, increased state flexibility, incentive funding, more consistent deference and integrated information systems. EPA is finalizing program guidance documents and will begin working with the states more closely, in concert with other Federal agencies. Federal agencies must work together if the Strategy is to be successfully implemented and achieved.

Roy Simon from the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, EPA Headquarters spoke to the value and importance of a partnership between Federal and state agencies. Such a partnership is crucial for:

- implementing state's Comprehensive Ground Water Protection Programs
- developing state-centered ground water programs driven by land use issues, consistent with EPA's Federal mandate

- protecting the ground water resource for both ecological and public health.

Mr. Simon then summarized the process for developing/approving core state programs and refining core programs into fully integrating programs as envisioned under the National Ground Water Strategy.

Because the Strategy is based on deference to state priorities, coordination between Federal and state agencies is necessary. The steps envisioned to improve coordination include:

- Develop and publish detailed descriptions of agency programs and initiatives
- Develop and implement a Federal agency technical assistance directory
- Establish Memorandums Of Agreement (MOAs) with agencies as necessary
- Implement mechanisms for continual and improved communication.

Mr. Simon reiterated the necessity for a partnership between Federal and state agencies to make the State CSGWPP approach work.

The Roundtable continued with the presentation of perspectives from other selected Federal agencies on EPA's Ground Water Strategy. John Vecchioli, from the Florida District Office of the U.S. Geological Survey, described the well-known role of the USGS in data collection and technical support for numerous Federal and state agency's activities. The USGS is a technically oriented agency and recognizes that the objectives of EPA's Ground Water Strategy are appropriate and necessary to pursue. He indicated the USGS's willingness to serve as the catalyst for ground water research, data management and technology transfer.

Matt Byers, a faculty member at Kentucky State University, represented the perspectives on research for USDA. Dr. Byers stressed the need to communicate among researchers, and to work together collaboratively to maximize limited resources. Dr. Byers indicated that existing mechanisms for transferring information are insufficiently utilized. Additionally, a large quantity of valuable research is never fully documented.

Chris Bennett, represented the Savannah River Site, U.S. Department of Energy, as one of its primary contractors in operating the facility. Mr. Bennett indicated that confusion exists among government agencies in trying to carry out different policies. Much of the inconsistency exists because different agencies have different missions. He stressed the need for communication and coordination at all levels of government, citing the

problems caused by having different requirements placed on the plant from different agencies. Also, since some agencies have an enforcement function over other agencies, the relationships among Federal agencies are at times strained. Furthermore, he suggests that cooperation and coordination should exist at two levels: technology and technology transfer and policy. Cooperation may be more likely under existing conditions with the technology and technology transfer than with policy. Perceived and actual conflicts over which agencies have authority under various circumstances need to be worked-out.

After the Federal perspectives on EPA's Ground Water Strategy were presented, representatives of two Southeastern states provided their viewpoints on the need for Federal-Federal and Federal-state cooperation. Rodney DeHan and Sonja Massey, from the Florida Department of Environmental Regulation and the Alabama Department of Environmental Management, respectively, were the state representatives. Florida and Alabama are at opposite ends of the spectrum in terms of population density and available resources. Florida has a high population density and highly vulnerable ground water resource areas. Florida also has greater resources available to dedicate to its environmental programs. Alabama on the other hand does not currently face the same population density problems as Florida and has limited resources available to dedicate to ground water protection activities. Alabama has been selected by EPA as a pilot project to exemplify how states can develop comprehensive plans consistent with EPA's strategy.

Observations made by the State representatives on the National Strategy and related issues include:

- The Strategy needs to address issues of regional concern
- More emphasis should be placed on linkage of Federal agencies
- The Biscayne Aquifer case study may be a model--but it was a "brush fire"
- Clarity of goals and commonality of interest among Federal agencies will help in implementing the Strategy
- No guidance exists to help maximize the use of inadequate resources currently available
- Federal agency priorities are determined by funding levels
- Need to deal with different and sometimes conflicting goals and priorities of states and Federal agencies
- States and Federal agencies must identity their barriers to implementing

CSGWPP. In some instances Federal and state agencies should work together to identify barriers

- Federal agencies should assume the role of mediating interstate issues, with consensus from states
- Federal agency roles should be based on recommendations of states--in consultation with Federal agencies within that state
- Cross boundary problems are best identified at local level in many cases
- Some Federal agencies are client driven, others are purpose driven
- Existing regulations do not allow flexibility alluded to in the Strategy
- Need to identify opportunities that Federal agencies have to support states "intrinsically" - that is, need to look at existing opportunities
- Groups that are involved in similar types of work need to identify ways to work together. This will undoubtedly cause turf battles
- The tendency exists to avoid the most difficult hurdles.

The next day the Roundtable was divided between plenary sessions and work group sessions that focused on specific issues and outcomes. A Federal Program Matrix (See Table II-1) was presented as a way of summarizing and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of different Federal agencies related to ground water. This matrix provides a framework for evaluating program and data collection voids, redundancies and areas of greatest need.

III. Work Sessions - Identification of Issues

The first series of work sessions focused on several tasks, including gaps and redundancies indicated by the Federal Program Matrix, barriers to implementation of effective ground water programs, and priority issues that should be addressed. The Matrix (Table II-1) summarizes the various jurisdictional responsibilities and programs related to ground water protection. The following summaries highlight the major ideas of work group members.

A. Gaps Identified by or in Matrix

1. A good technology transfer mechanism is needed, e.g., research on field applications needs to get out to the states at the program levels, and to other Federal agencies; What mechanisms are currently available within individual agencies?

2. Federal agencies' boundaries need to be integrated to minimize redundancies in research.

3. Involve academia in research/technology needs

4. Identify Federal counterparts to coordinate with state agencies, and develop a formal mechanism for communication with state agencies.

5. The following groups should be added to the matrix: **HUD** (source and supply, indirect involvement, and consumer of information); **EPA**; **the military branches of DOD** (Air Force, Army and Navy) - different services, different regional commands follow different policies; **DOE: Pinellas Plant**; **BIA** (Bureau of Indian Affairs); **DHHS** (ATSDR) - involved with public health assessments for hazardous waste sites, collects data on affected populations and works with other state and Federal agencies for public health; **NOAA**

6. USDA Cooperative State Research Service is the Federal counterpart to State Extension Services

7. At the state level, the South Carolina Water Resources Committee should be identified

8. Would it be best to group state agencies together in the matrix, or break - up by state?

9. A separate matrix should exist for State and Federal Agencies

10. State offices of Federal agencies need to be included: gaps that exist include the state office of the USGS; DOI - water research institutes in states; Sea grant programs state counterparts; Gulf of Mexico Program (EPA); Trustees (eg. NOAA); DOD (eg. Navy, Army)

11. Differences in responses occur from the same agencies (need consistency review within various agencies)

12. The matrix should: identify and characterize agency activity; data generators vs. data users; active regulatory role v. data gatherers; contact and phone number for each level within agency; within agency communication (i.e. ground water policy); is there a declared mission for the agency?; jurisdictional boundaries of agencies; funding (source of funds), where is money going? Federal/state contacts; internal regulations

13. State vs. Federal authority needs to be clarified; Federal agencies need to know what states are doing as much as vice versa

14. Need to focus on the regulated community, not groups with enforcement authority

15. Most focus is on data management, however gaps exist in data management summary

16. A mechanism for communication among Federal agencies and between Federal and state agencies needs to be developed. Additionally, a systematic way of knowing who to communicate with on specific issues is also needed

17. Difficulty exists in identifying gaps in infrastructure and technological issues.

B. Redundancies Identified by or in Matrix

Several redundancies were noted that should be considered in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of ground water programs. As resources become more scarce, addressing redundancies becomes more important. Identified redundancies include:

1. Communication across data bases; differences in data entry, data management, data monitoring cause different report generation in different formats

2. More than one Federal agency or Federal program addressing same problem at one facility or conducting similar studies on same issue

3. Duplication of Federal activities by different Federal agencies

4. At Federal sites, agencies are working independently and in isolation of each other but addressing the same type of problems

5. Communication failures exist and therefore we may not know where redundancies exist

6. Health guidelines for hazardous substances (in some cases, EPA's are different from ATSDR's "Health Advisories")

7. Different programs, responsibilities and missions of agencies is confusing to public; community relations, public involvement interface are needed

8. Overlapping laws (e.g., Clean up goals, RCRA/CERCLA) are a problem

9. Clarification of variable standards for clean up goals, health, etc. is necessary

10. Clarifying state's responsibilities over Federal facilities for ground water protection. (Federal Facilities Compliance Act).

C. Barriers to Implementation

Following the discussions intended to identify gaps and redundancies in program activities and responsibilities, discussion turned to identifying potential barriers to implementing the National Strategy. The following barriers were noted:

1. Data collection redundancies, data base inconsistencies and incompatibilities and lack of communication (e.g., computer, information networks) between Federal programs and data bases (it was noted that concerns with redundancies does not eliminate the need for site-specific studies)

2. Incompatibilities exist between and among different agencies and even among different EPA programs (e.g., CERCLA, RCRA) requirements; inconsistencies exist in the application of existing standards/policies

3. Because of liability and litigation concerns, Federal Agencies are reluctant to be open with information

4. Compliance with one program can result in noncompliance with the other

5. Adversarial relations sometimes exist between EPA as the regulator and other Federal agencies as the regulated entity; this adversarial relationship can be a barrier to communication efforts

6. Lack of clarity concerning whether EPA or the State program is to take the lead role

7. Inherent problems exist with RCRA related to overall ground water protection goals - RCRA needs to be revisited and improved

8. Lack of Federal and state ground water standards

9. Lack of communication mechanisms by EPA to inform other Federal agencies of how EPA's actions and programs affect other agency initiatives

10. Limitations of existing knowledge about research and lack of communication

11. Lag between Federal regulations and state adoption of their

programs

12. Existing structure of regulations (source oriented rather than program oriented i.e., regulations are not consistent across programs)

13. Lack of resources at state level

14. Lack of EPA and other funding for research

15. Economic implications of policies and guidance; what is the reality of accomplishing existing statutes?

16. Federal laws lead to a fragmented approach to ground water protection.

D. Barriers to Better Communication, Cooperation and Coordination

One of the major themes discussed at the Roundtable is the issue of communication and cooperation among various agencies and researchers involved with ground water issues. Improved communication and cooperation are broadly supported objectives, yet are recognized as problematic for various reasons. Participants were asked to identify the barriers, and ultimately, suggested approaches to communication and cooperation.

1. Pathways to interagency communication are not clear - communication at various, and appropriate, levels are difficult

2. Conflicts between existing regulations and enforcement procedures need to be resolved

3. Need to develop/maintain good interagency relationships, and mechanisms for conflict resolution

4. Need to develop mechanisms for exchange among Federal agencies in ground water protection (future roundtable meetings?)

5. Clearly defined state and Federal roles are lacking

6. Lack of consistent ground water goals amongst agencies

7. Presence of conflicts between EPA and State programs

8. Different organizational cultures create problems in some instances; good communication tools are insufficiently incorporated into management cultures

9. Turf protection and empire building

10. Funding

11. Lack of institutional structures affecting institutional memory.

12. Differing priorities and missions and lack of clarity on policies; defining the resource and clarity on definitions.

E. Top Priorities

Given the identified gaps and redundancies in ground water programs, Roundtable participants were asked to set priorities among issues to be addressed. If progress is to be made in improving ground water protection strategies, what must happen. Top priorities include:

1. Identify and eliminate legislative barriers by matching authority to responsibility; rewrite statutes to promote coordination and eliminate fragmentation and overlapping approaches to ground water

2. Overcome (inter- and intra-agency) conflicts related to missions, policies, incentives, and resource orientations by developing organization-specific plans to address conflicts

3. Improve leadership by identifying who has the authority to lead, and who should be given which responsibilities; establish clear and consistent division of authority

4. Expand resources, translated as time, funds and people

5. Establish consistency in technical, research and development, and data management programs; improve technology transfer

6. Enhance interagency communications

7. Resolve regulatory/enforcement conflicts within EPA and among agencies

8. Clearly define Federal and State roles; categorize roles of agencies - regulators (scale), define missions/responsibilities

9. Clarify statement of ground water strategy - protection, prevention and clean-up

10. Improve communication at all levels

11. Provide for the consistent interpretation of regulations, including continuity across boundaries (state/regulatory)

12. Commit to making needed changes and providing leadership

13. Establish the core comprehensive state ground water programs endorsed by EPA as the focal point for ground water programs.

IV. Work Sessions - Action Plans

The next set of work sessions focused on action plans and approaches to addressing five specific priority issues; coordination and cooperation, resources and funding, statutes, research and technology transfer, and the ground water steering committee.

A. Improving Coordination and Cooperation

One approach to achieving greater coordination and cooperation is through incentives and other mechanisms that result in explicit and implicit benefits. Participants noted several such approaches, including:

1. Extol the benefits of stretching existing resources farther; use existing funds more effectively through prevention of contamination, targeting priorities, etc.

2. Institute a mechanism that rewards multi-interdisciplinary and program involvement

3. Lend and borrow staff amongst Federal agencies; establish liaisons (inter- and intra-agency); use existing expertise of other agencies; identify overlaps of other agencies; develop IAGS

5. Continue meetings like Roundtable; develop a list of mutual goals

6. Engage stakeholders in decisions - (e.g., Regulatory Negotiation)

7. Establish Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) groups and charters

8. Convince individuals of benefits - education; incentives; awards; recognition; promotions

9. Determine shared interests to define the scope of cooperation

10. Identify incentives: identify potential cost savings (sharing resources); case studies; specific demonstrations

11. Identify "do able" projects where cooperation is in the best interests of groups

12. Lobby for high level support for the Ground Water Strategy; need the buy-in of agency heads, business and environmental groups

13. Create a Steering Committee to identify workgroups and issues - a "facilitated" state/Federal group; educate and inform the public to support steering group (bring into process); Steering committee needs to have formal protocol with firm commitments of responsibility among members. It also needs stability of membership.

14. Use computer network to identify research (ground water bulletin board for communication) to focus new work and communicate what is being/has been accomplished

15. Establish a process for identifying differences and similarities in missions, incentives, and policies, legislation; one possible approach is:

    Process for identifying differences

    - Federal agency ground water profiles (i.e., detailed matrix-could be part of MOUs)
    - Federal agency self assessments and role identification
    - Federal agency assessments should be followed up with a "grand" Federal plan
    - Identification of lead contact within each agency
    - Assessments - can the agency achieve the goals of the Strategy? Obstacles need to be noted and ways to overcome obstacles discussed- EPA and states should be involved in development of these assessments through review, etc. Including discussion of enabling legislation
    - Guidance should be finalized before steering committee protocol and assessment framework is set

16. Design MOUs similar to "comprehensive" plans-broadly scoped and structured along CSGWPP guidelines

17. Set up coordination at state level amongst prevention and remediation activities

18. MOUs should be of two types: 1. Basic patterns of cooperation - identify shared goals, reflect commitment to work with State in developing their comprehensive plans; 2. Other agreements developed as needed over time - align these MOUs with 6 strategic elements - National-->regional

19. Establish a place/mechanism for information sharing of all ground water data.

B. Expanding Resources and Improving Allocation of Funds

Another crucial issue identified is the availability and allocation of funds to accomplish ground water protection priorities and management strategies. The following comments and suggestions address this issue:

1. Identify sources of funds; convene a meeting of agencies that have resources to assess needs and develop strategies to support comprehensive planning and programming

2. Identify incentives for agencies

3. Document success stories of resource sharing; develop a proposal/case study that demonstrates benefits

4. Market expertise; use other existing expertise when available; improve resource utilization; "Synergism" (e.g., resource directory)

5. Issue an Executive Order to support new funding strategies and priorities

6. Conduct a needs assessment

7. Identify needs and programs, such as GIS, that can be developed cooperatively

8. Identify common goals to lead to joint activities (perhaps a task for the Steering Committee); develop joint work plans linked to the allocation of funds

9. Communicate with Congress to influence allocations

10. Investigate state use of user fees on regulated community - (enforcement actions, permit fees); earmark funds for ground water trust fund

11. Federal funds are never enough - they need to be augmented

12. DOE Interagency Agreements/Grants (to states) is one possibility

13. Involve more states in workplans/goal setting to affect leveraging and influencing resources

14. Shift focus from monitoring to active clean up.

C. Rewrite Statutes

Another major priority identified by participants is the need to improve the legislative environment affecting ground water resources. While the difficulties of doing so were acknowledged, participants broadly supported the need to rewrite statutes to improve cooperation, coordination and clarity about objectives and jurisdictional responsibilities - in essence to establish common objectives, clear priorities and consistent interpretation. Ideas presented include:

1. Draft new legislation with a program resource focus
2. Develop regulatory analysis of existing regulations and how they address ground water (Federal and state)
3. Identify appropriate regulation oversight group(s) (Congress and Executive Branch)
4. Identify and bring together constituency to garner support for legislation
5. Establish high level state support
6. Share rulemaking agendas (e.g., through liaison)
7. Foster broad participation in the rulemaking process; work with non-governmental organizations
8. Clarify the need for new legislation in a powerful and convincing manner
9. Resolve CERCLA/RCRA conflicts, rewrite to avoid existing redundancy
10. Establish a state task force to address this issue.

D. Research and Technology Transfer

Another identified priority is the need for improved and enhanced technology transfer. Suggestions for achieving this objective include:

1. Establish a reference agency for information exchange (e.g., a Clearinghouse)

2. Establish EPAs role to transfer technology to states (e.g., CD Roms)

3. Extension Services provide information via INTERNET

4. Identify existing technology activities and research, and coordinate access to activity

5. Expand EPA/Federal Agency exchange of technology

6. Establish cooperation and coordination mechanics and incentives

7. Identify links with Extension Services, and their potential roles

8. Identify ground water data bases (matrix) and organizations collecting data (also professional organizations)

9. Develop mechanisms to get "gray" literature (unpublished reports) into the system.

E. Establish a Ground Water Steering Committee

In preparation for the Roundtable, EPA recognized the need for a vehicle to continue dialogue, planning and cooperation between and among Federal agencies. In addition, in keeping with the National Strategy, this group, the Ground Water Steering Committee, should also have representatives of state government to improve the state-Federal interface. Appendix 1 list the proposed members of the Steering Committee which served as the basis for discussion. A group such as the Steering Committee was strongly supported by most Roundtable participants. Comments concerning the Steering Committee include:

1. The Steering Committee should have senior level commitment at HQ and regional levels of EPA and all other key Federal agencies, in writing

2. As proposed, the group is too large; too many Federal agency representatives are suggested; needs to be no bigger than 15 or 20

3. Management support should be provided by Federal agencies

4. The Steering Committee should have defined, measurable goals

5. Other similar committees should be evaluated for operational style, format, etc., such as the National Estuarine Program of EPA

6. How is commitment to this Committee best attained?

7. Perhaps each Federal agency should select a member from its internal committee

8. The Committee should act in an advisory capacity to EPA to handle roadblocks and barriers; it should make recommendations to EPA's Regional Administrator

9. The Committee should be the primary framework for interagency coordination (e.g., monitor interagency agreements)

10. Mechanisms are needed for informing who is doing what

11. Common goals should be negotiated amongst Federal agencies

12. The Committee should assist states in developing/managing Ground Water programs

13. The Committee should act as a dispute resolution/negotiation mechanism; it should negotiate good relationships between regulatory agencies and regulated agencies

14. The Committee should include TVA, State geological surveys, State water resource commissions, U.S. Coast Guard, DOD - other divisions want to be included; add cooperative state research service (under USDA); add state liaisons (congressional staff organizations); add EPA HQ; add non-governmental organizations

15. Technology transfer should be an agenda item for the Committee

16. The Committee should serve as a bottom-up mechanism to raise ground water issues to agency leaders/top brass; but need a high-level channel for the steering committee

17. As one model, the Committee should be formed by letting each agency provide a representative - (e.g. 1 per/agency/region) - who then reports to agencies within that department; establish a network of committees below steering committee

18. Need to balance size of committee vs. interest of each agency within given department; each department could caucus in selecting Steering Committee representatives

19. Perhaps have State Advisory Committees, with each sending one representative to Steering Committee; states have to be provided with an opportunity to express their interests

20. As an agenda item, the Committee should identify the existing regulatory framework affecting ground water as a baseline

21. Steering Committee needs a formalized protocol for members to follow; meeting frequency, location, etc. need to be clarified

22. The mission statement needs clarification

23. National level committees need to address legislative changes

24. Must develop structure for dissenting information/voices from the Committee.

V. Closing remarks

Ron Mikulak, Chief of the Ground Water Technology and Management Section of EPA Region IV, made closing comments. He indicated that EPA is committed to continuing the dialogue begun at the Roundtable and will take steps to move it forward. He received several closing comments from participants, including:

- Something is needed from Region IV indicating what has been accomplished from this meeting (Meeting Summary, as well as next steps)
- Address CERCLA/RCRA consistency/coordination issues
- Coordinate across programs important to states and the need to mesh these programs
- Solicit state comments on future actions
- How can Federal resources be made available to states?
- What about the Grants Handbook - for all Federal Agencies? What will it contain? How will it be used?
- Need to clarify mechanisms for "really" achieving a unified effort/approach to ground water protection.

Mr. Mikulak indicated that EPA will consider the many recommendations made at the Roundtable before making further recommendations concerning the composition and protocols of the Steering Committee. Also, the Steering Committee will be the vehicle for dealing with the many important substantive issues raised at the Roundtable. He also indicated that a Meeting Summary would be prepared and distributed as a record of the comments and recommendations from the Roundtable. The next step will be formation of the Steering Committee with continued dialogue from other Federal agencies and the states.